

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.tispto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILIN	IG DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/831,422	07/24/2001		Jean Paul Remon	522-1741	4232
75	90	02/12/2004		EXAMINER	
Barnes & Tho	rnburg		JOYNES, ROBERT M		
PO Box 2786 Chicago, IL 60690-2786			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
Cincups, 12 00070 2700				1615	

DATE MAILED: 02/12/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)					
Advisory Action	09/831,422	REMON, JEAN PAUL					
	Examiner	Art Unit					
	Robert M. Joynes	1615					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence add	ress				
THE REPLY FILED 29 December 2003 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.							
PERIOD FOR RE	PLY [check either a) or b)]						
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection. b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).							
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.							
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:							
(a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);							
(b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);							
(c) they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or							
(d) they present additional claims without cancel NOTE:	ing a corresponding number of	finally rejected clair	ns.				
Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection.	tion(s):						
Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).		eparate, timely filed	d amendment				
5. ☑ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☑ request for application in condition for allowance because: See		sidered but does NO	OT place the				
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered be raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	cause it is not directed SOLELY	to issues which we	re newly				
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims w			and an				
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:							
Claim(s) allowed:							
Claim(s) objected to:							
Claim(s) rejected:							
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:							
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) app	proved or b) disapproved by	the Examiner.					
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s)							
0. Other:							

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: while applicant has attempted to distinguish the instant claims over the prior art, it is the position of the Examiner that said distinction is recited in the claims. Applicants argue that diffusion-controlled systems fall into two basic categories: reservoir devices and matrix devices. Applicants further define each type of device and state that the cited references are matrix type systems while the instant claims are drawn to reservoir devices. The Examiner appreciates the difference between the two types of devices but fails to see how the distinctions are recited in the instant claims. In other words, the instant claims do not recite limitations that would distinguish the claims as a reservoir system over the prior art of record. Therefore, the rejections would be maintained. Applicant's arguments are not found persuasive.

Gollamudi S. Kishore, PhD Primary Examiner

Group 1600